

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application. Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0181656 issued to Stern et al. Claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stern in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,516,410 issued to Heller. Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stern in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,357,621 issued to Cox. Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stern in view of Cox and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,872,967 issued to DeRoo et al. Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stern in view of Cox and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,671,413 issued to Shipman et al. Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stern in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,317,853 issued to Hikone et al. Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stern in view of Hikone and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,550,023 issued to Brauch et al. Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stern in view of Hikone and Brauch and further in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0068679 issued to Vellolil et al. Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stern in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0073771 issued to Chen et al. Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2005/0081024 issued to Khatri et al in view of Chen. Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khatri in view of Chen and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,954,831 issued to Chang and U.S. Patent No. 6,697,978 issued to Bear et al. Claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khatri in view of Chen, Chang and Bear, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,139,954 issued to Korhonen. Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khatri in view of Chen, Chang, Bear, Korhonen and Cox. Claim 14 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khatri in view of DeRoo. Claim 15 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khatri in view of Shipman. Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khatri in view of Heller. Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0125908 issued to Wynn et al, in view of Chen. Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Wynn and Chen in view of DeRoo. Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wynn, Chen, DeRoo, Chang and Bear. Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wynn, Chen, DeRoo, Chang, Bear and Hikone. The Examiner has assembled a considerable number of references. Applicants respectfully traverse. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

Claim 1 stands rejected as anticipated by Stern. Applicants respectfully submit that Stern fails to disclose “SIMD registers” as is recited by Claim 1. In the Examiner’s Remarks, the Examiner states that “parallel processors and memory modules are the same as Single Instruction / Multiple Data (SIMD) architecture and registers respectively.” The Examiner offers no evidence to support this statement. Instead, as is suggested by Chen, SIMD registers are used for multimedia information and are not addressed by Stern. Accordingly, Stern cannot anticipate Claim 1.

Claims 2-9 stand rejected as obvious over Stern in view of various references. Applicants respectfully point out that Stern has a common assignee with the present application at the time the invention was made and therefore cannot be used as a reference under Section 103. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to Claims 2-9.

Claims 10 and 17 each recite the use of SIMD registers and the MOVNTDQ instruction for writing and reading memory test data. The Examiner admits that Khatri (Claim 10) and Wynn (Claim 17) fail to teach, disclose or suggest SIMD registers and the MOVNTDQ instruction. The Examiner relies upon Chen, stating that SIMD registers are found in paragraph [0053] and the Movq instruction on page 7 in tables 1 & 2 with cache hit/miss is the same as MOVNTDQ and memory testing. Again, the Examiner fails to provide evidence to support his interpretation. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that nothing in Chen discloses, teaches or suggests the use of an SIMD register for testing memory. SIMD registers as described in paragraph [0053] are for multimedia use. No teaching, suggestion or disclosure in the references cited by the Examiner supports the use of multimedia registers to test memory. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to Claims 10-20.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

The Commissioner is authorized to deduct any additional fees which may be necessary and to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 502264.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically submitted to the COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS via EFS on October 15, 2007.

/Robert W. Holland/

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert W. Holland/

Robert W. Holland
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 40,020